



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,797	04/15/2004	Masayuki Satake	UNI079.023AUS	6655

20995 7590 08/02/2005

Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP
2040 Main Street
Fourteenth Floor
Irvine, CA 92614

EXAMINER

HON, SOW FUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/824,797	Applicant(s) SATAKE ET AL.	
	Examiner Sow-Fun Hon	Art Unit 1772	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04/15/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/15/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (US 5,700,623) as evidenced by Cloots (US 6,197,418).

Regarding claims 1-2, Anderson teaches an antistatic layer comprising a polymer binder and an antistatic agent (abstract). The antistatic agent comprises polyaniline and polythiophene (column 6, lines 5-10), which are water soluble or water dispersible conductive polymers, as defined by Applicant's specification (original claim 2).

Anderson teaches that the antistatic layer is laminated (superposed) on at least one side of a polymer film which is part of a photographic bar code label (abstract), and discloses prior art wherein the polymer film is a transparent polyethylene terephthalate (support, column 2, lines 4-10), which is an optical film by virtue of its transparency. Therefore, although Anderson fails to teach that the polymer film is an optical one, because Anderson discloses prior art which teaches a transparent polymer film which is an optical film by virtue of its transparency, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have laminated the antistatic layer of Anderson on at least one side of an optical film, in order to obtain an optical film free of static problems.

Regarding claim 3, Anderson teaches that the antistatic layer has a surface resistance of 5

Art Unit: 1772

X 1011 ohm/square (column 5, lines 50-52) which is within the claimed range of 1 X 1012 ohm/square or less.

Regarding claims 4-5, Anderson teaches a pressure sensitive adhesive layer (column 3, lines 35-38). Anderson teaches a pressure-sensitive adhesive layer laminated on another side of a surface having the film of the antistatic layer (backing layer, column 6, lines 35-38), formed of an acrylic pressure sensitive adhesive (acrylate elastomer, column 6, lines 35-45).

Regarding claim 8, Anderson teaches that an activation treatment is given to the optical film, in the form of coating with a primer layer (column 6, lines 59-62) to activate the surface of the optical film to allow for adhesion of the antistatic layer (column 6, lines 58-68).

Regarding claim 9, Anderson teaches a method for manufacturing an antistatic optical film comprising an antistatic layer at least on one side of an optical film, comprising the steps of applying an aqueous solution or aqueous dispersion (from aqueous medium) comprising a water soluble or a water dispersible conductive polymer (water soluble interpolymers or polyaniline or polythiophene, column 6, lines 1-10) on the optical film; and drying to form the antistatic layer (column 7, lines 29-33).

3. Claims 6-7, 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson as applied to claims 1-5, 8-9 above, and further in view of Shibue (US 6,503,581).

Anderson teaches an antistatic optical film comprising an antistatic layer laminated on at least one side of an optical film, wherein the antistatic layer comprises a water soluble or a water dispersible conductive polymer, as discussed above. In addition, Anderson teaches that the antistatic layer is provided to protect the optical film which is prone to the generation of static electric charges during the manufacture of the optical film (column 2, lines 20-30).

Art Unit: 1772

Regarding claims 6-7, Anderson fails to teach that the optical film comprises a polarizing plate, or that a surface material of the optical film on which the antistatic layer is laminated is a polycarbonate.

Shibue teaches that during the manufacture (preparing) a polarizing plate, a protective layer of polyester or polycarbonate is provided to minimize optical deformation (column 19, lines 1-15).

Therefore, because Shibue teaches that a protective layer of polyester or polycarbonate is provided to minimized optical deformation during the manufacture of a polarizing plate, and Anderson teaches that the antistatic layer is provided to protect the optical film from static electric charges generated during the manufacture of the optical film, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have laminated the polarizing plate of Shibue to the antistatic optical film of Anderson, in order to obtain a polarizing plate protected from optical deformation and static electric charges during manufacture.

Regarding claims 10-11, Anderson fails to teach an image viewing display comprising at least one of the antistatic optical film, let alone a liquid crystal display which comprises a liquid crystal cell of VA mode, wherein the antistatic optical film is provided on one side or both sides of the liquid crystal cell. Since claim 11 depends on claim 10 which depends on claim 1, it is proper in its dependency.

Shibue teaches a liquid crystal display in which the image viewing display comprises a liquid crystal cell of VA mode (column 3, lines 5-15), wherein during the manufacture (preparing) a polarizing plate, a protective layer of polyester or polycarbonate is provided to

Art Unit: 1772

minimize optical deformation (column 19, lines 1-15).

Therefore, because Shibue teaches that a protective layer of polyester or polycarbonate is provided to minimize optical deformation during the manufacture, and Anderson teaches that the antistatic layer is provided to protect the optical film from static electric charges generated during the manufacture of the optical film, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have provided one or both sides of the liquid crystal cell of VA mode of the liquid crystal display of Shibue with the antistatic optical film of Anderson, in order to obtain a liquid crystal display with a liquid crystal cell of VA mode, protected from optical deformation and static electric charges during manufacture, with the viewing characteristics provided by a VA mode.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sow-Fun Hon whose telephone number (571)272-1492. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached on (571)272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Application/Control Number: 10/824,797

Page 6

Art Unit: 1772

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S. Hon

Sow-Fun Hon

01/07/05